## REMARKS

This is in response to the official action dated June 2, 2004. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 28 has been amended in accordance with the examiner's suggestion, such that "the antislipping agents consisting of fine particles of an average particle diameter of 10μm or less".

Claims 28-38 stand rejected as being obvious over Craven in view of *Polymer Science*. The examiner admits that Craven teaches particles over a wide range, being greater than applicant's claimed range of an average particle size of less than 10 microns. In fact, Craven teaches particle size with average diameter up to 105 microns. Thus, Craven clearly does not teach a limitation as set forth by applicant.

As to the thickness of the applied layer, examiner states that there is no showing of unexpected results for a layer of 10 microns or less. Applicant submits herewith a declaration under Rule 132, in which it shown in Section 3 that an optimal Energy consumption is achieved at 10 microns thickness.

The examiner states that even a greater thickness layer applied by the prior art would eventually wear down to 10 microns or less. However, there is no teaching to provide such a layer as a starting point to achieve optimal energy consumption, particularly in combination with the fine particles having an average particle diameter of less than 10 microns. Even if Craven's layer were to wear down to 10 microns or less, there is no suggestion that the layer at that point should have the claimed particle size

as well; and certainly no possibility that Craven would 'inherently' end up with such a corresponding particle size at that point.

Therefore, the claims as amended are not obvious over the cited art, and a notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By _____
Bruce S. Londa
Reg. No. 33,531

Norris, McLaughlin & Marcus, P.A.
875 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10022
(212) 808-0700